

## EVERGREEN ♦ EAST HILLS VISION STRATEGY

The fourth meeting of the Evergreen East Hills Vision Strategy Task Force was held on November 16, 2005 at the San José City Hall, 200 East Santa Clara Street, Wing 118, San José. Vice Chair Nora Campos called the session to order at 6:35 p.m. The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

---

### **Task Force Members Present:**

Chair Dave Cortese, Vice-Chair Nora Campos, Councilmember Madison Nguyen, Sylvia Alvarez, Jenny Chang, Chris Corpus, Alan Covington, Steven Cox, Nancy Dellamattera, Steve Dunn, Joe Head, Mike Hill, Lou Kvitek, Bob Levy, Maria Lopez, Gordon Lund, Mark Milioto, Al Munoz, Khanh Nguyen, Melanie Richardson, Vince Songcayawon, Ike White, Homing Yip, J. Manuel Herrera, Dave Zenker, Jim Zito, George Perez

### **Members of the Public Present:**

Linda Montagano, Ruben Dominguez, Shauna Sanders, John Buffi, Kelly Erardi, Pat Sausedo, Alan Garofalo, Ellie Glass, George Reilly, Phaedra Ellis-Lamkis, Terry Gotcher, Bob Rivet, Ed Abelite, Carlos DaSilva, José Aranda, Mark Lazzarini, Tony Seebach, Carol Ashman, Anthony Drummond, James Kawamoto, Leola Watkins

### **Developer Community Present:**

Henry Cord, Menka Sethi, Mike Keaney, Tom Armstrong, Patrick Spillane, Gretchen Sauer, Gerry DeYoung

### **Staff Present:**

Kip Harkness, Laurel Prevetti, Andrew Crabtree, John Baty, Dave Mitchell, Rabia Chaudhry, Louansee Moua, Todd Rufo

---

### **Introductions**

Task Force members introduced themselves.

### **Market Retail Study Memorandum:**

Vice Chair Campos reviewed Chair Dave Cortese's memorandum regarding the *Evergreen Area Retail Study*. Chairperson Cortese recommended that the Task Force:

- (1) Note and file the *Evergreen Area Retail Study* prepared by Metrovation/ Bay Area Economics.

- (2) Direct staff to agendaize retail discussion for the second Task Force meeting in February 2006 and provide additional analysis pertinent to this discussion to the Task Force by February 1, 2006.

Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement Department, indicated that any thoughts or perspectives regarding the *Evergreen Area Retail Study* for Task Force consideration should be completed by early 2006.

### **Approval of October 19, 2005 Meeting Summary:**

Copies of the summary of the meeting held on October 19, 2005 were provided to the Task Force members. After review, it was agreed that the meeting summary accurately summarized the October 19 meeting.

### **Outreach and Work Plan Update:**

Laurel provided an update of the EEHVS outreach and stated that the City would continue to work with various neighborhood associations. Neighborhood associations interested in having city staff make an EEHVS presentation can contact John Baty, EEHVS project manager.

Laurel indicated that staff is revising the EEHVS work plan. The process will be slowed down to increase community engagement. EEHVS meetings will now have a topic-based approach. For instance, tonight's Task Force meeting focuses on development applications. The revised work plan will be released after approval by the Task Force chair and vice chair.

The December 20, 2005 Task Force meeting has been rescheduled to Wednesday, December 14, 2005.

### **Announcements:**

Vice-Chair Campos announced that Kip Harkness, manager of the City's Strong Neighborhood Initiative program, would facilitate the remainder of the Task Force meetings.

### **Development Applications:**

Kip explained that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss the conceptual site plans for each EEHVS opportunity site: Pleasant Hills Golf Course, Evergreen Valley College, Campus Industrial, and Arcadia.

John Baty reviewed a handout regarding the summary of major development applications.

#### **a. Pleasant Hills Golf Course**

Joe Head, with Summerhill Homes, and Drew Koznik, with KB Homes, presented the conceptual site plan for the Pleasant Hills Golf Course site. The proposal includes 450 small lot single-family units, 225 garden townhomes, and 150 townhomes. Amenities include Lake Cunningham trail, a proposed fire station, and a ±10 acre park/sports complex site reserved for a potential school.

**b. Evergreen Valley College**

Mike Hill, with the San Jose/Evergreen Community College District, presented the conceptual site plan for the Evergreen Valley College site. He provided the Task Force with a handout listing key talking points and a handout that evaluates the College's planning principles against the key outcomes of the EEHVS. The proposal includes 50 townhomes, 450 multi-family units, and 195,000 square feet of commercial/office. Amenities include a new library. Mr. Hill explained that the proposed project would address affordable housing needs and the area's desire for convenient retail.

**c. Campus Industrial**

Steve Dunn, with Legacy Partners, presented the conceptual site plan for the Campus Industrial properties. The proposal includes 500 large lot single-family units, 675 small lot single-family units, and 825 garden townhomes. Amenities include Fowler trail, Evergreen Creek trail, a ±10 acre park/sports complex site reserved for a potential school, and a ±7 acre little league fields. Mr. Dunn indicated that the proposed land use changes to residential and park/open space uses would cover 65 percent of the EEHVS amenities list, whereas existing industrial uses only cover one percent of the amenities list.

**d. Arcadia**

Gerry DeYoung, with Arcadia, presented the conceptual site plan for the Arcadia site. Mr. DeYoung indicated that in 1973, the Arcadia site was planned for 363 single-family detached homes. However, the new proposal includes 65 garden townhomes, 210 townhomes, 1,600 multi-family units with ground floor retail. Building height will be up to six stories, with the highest densities along Capitol Expressway. Parts of the project area are constrained by the airport safety zone.

Task Force members attending the meeting had the following questions and comments, with responses from the presenting developers and city staff:

**Comment/Question**

**Response/Answer**

**Comment/Question****Response/Answer**

What is the staff's perspective on these conceptual site plans?

Staff would need more details before evaluation.

How will Evergreen Valley College address future educational needs by developing this site?

Density of Evergreen Valley College new instructional buildings could be increased on existing surface parking areas. Structured parking could replace surface parking. Evergreen Valley College has a maximum capacity of 20,000 students.

Is it appropriate to use public funds from Measure G to build parking structures?

Measure G would be used to build classrooms, not parking structures.

Does the proposed library at the Evergreen Valley College site take into account the new Tully Community Branch Library?

Why is the 5-acre commercially zoned property not shown on the Pleasant Hills Golf Course site?

The property is better served as public open space and residential uses.

In regards to the Pleasant Hills Golf Course project, concerned that existing homes fronting White Road would not have an adequate buffer.

The Project will continue to be refined.

In regards to the Pleasant Hills Golf Course project, concerned about the traffic conditions at the ingress and egress on Flint Avenue and Vista Verde Drive.

Developers proposed three additional alternative accesses.

In regards to the Pleasant Hills Golf Course site, is the proposed fire station part of the General Plan or is it a relocation?

Community has not had an opportunity to provide input Pleasant Hills Golf Course project.

Noted.

| <b>Comment/Question</b>  | <b>Response/Answer</b>  |
|--|---|
| Need more information regarding the proposed school on the Arcadia property (i.e., school built in school district land? Would the school be built as part of the EEHVS process?). |   |
| Concerned that an elementary school is proposed in the area's biggest traffic corridor.  | Noted.  |
| Concerned that 10 acres is not adequate for a school site.   | Noted.  |
| Concerned that parks at the proposed joint use schools/parks sites would not be fully accessible by the public at all times.   | Noted.  |
| Development of the four opportunity sites would generate 3,000 K-12 students, 1,000 of which are high school students.   | Noted.  |
| Is there a proposed high school?   | No.   |
| Need a new high school. New development would overcrowd existing high schools.   | Noted.  |
| Suggested including projected student data and the high school as a future work plan discussion items.   | Noted.  |
| Regarding the Campus Industrial properties, if the proposed project covers 65 percent of the amenities list, how will the remaining 35 percent of the amenities list be covered?   | The EEHVS is a group effort. All four opportunity sites, as proposed together, would cover all items on the amenities list. |
| Concerned that the amenities list does not meet the community's needs.   | Noted.  |

**Comment/Question****Response/Answer**

The current development proposal is based on the amenities list. If the amenities list changes, would the proposed development change as well?

Would like to see alternative plans for lower density development, not just high-density development. What amenities would there be with lower density development?

Would like more details regarding affordable housing (i.e., number of affordable units, level of affordability, criteria, distribution, etc.).

Affordability level would be per the city's definition. There will be greater details in the future after discussion with the city's Housing Department.

What is the percentage of teacher housing?

Teacher housing will be provided through affordable housing. There will be greater details in the future.

Concerned that the proposed 195,000 square feet of commercial/office uses may be too high.

Noted.

There are existing overcrowded conditions even without any new development.

Noted.

Concerned about parking.

Noted.

How will the SNI planning process affect the EEHVS?

The community and the city's Parks, Recreation and Neighborhood Services Department would decide where parks and the community center is located. Developers are neutral in regards to the location of the community center. The West Evergreen SNI is committed to locating the community center in the existing neighborhood.

**Comment/Question****Response/Answer**

The new community center should serve the existing Meadowfair and West Evergreen SNI neighborhoods.

Noted.

**Public Comments****Comment/Question****Response/Answer**

Appreciated the transportation analysis workshop. The proposed interchanges will improve traffic flow.

High-density development would worsen traffic conditions.

Traffic will increase by Highway 101 and Tully Road. Need to address.

Traffic on San Felipe and Yerba Buena Roads would be infeasible with existing streets.

Trails should be a priority.

Against developing the Evergreen Valley College site. The project would create traffic congestion.

In regards to the Evergreen Valley College site, need to decrease the density.

Pleasant Hills Golf Course proposal needs to go to the community for input.

In regards to the Pleasant Hills Golf Course site, there are not any buffers proposed between the new development and existing residents that currently front the golf course.

**Comment/Question****Response/Answer**

In regards to the Pleasant Hills Golf Course site, recommended widening Flint Avenue.

In regards to the Pleasant Hills Golf Course site, Tully and White Roads is a busy intersection for the location of an elementary school.

In regards to the Pleasant Hills Golf Course site, the school can be located on Tully and White Roads and still be located in the Evergreen Elementary School District. Recommended locating the school in the northeast corner of the site by Flint Avenue so that existing students could also attend the new school.

10 acres is not adequate for joint use school/park.

Would like to see a school, not joint use school/park.

How will the EEHVS accommodate high school students?

Need a new high school, preferably located in the southern portion of the project area.

The proposed million-dollar homes do not fit with the existing neighborhoods.

In regards to the Arcadia site, the community center should be located by the existing neighborhood.

Residents would not have easy access to the proposed parks unless they live in the new community.

Where is the open space?



**Comment/Question****Response/Answer**

Against all development. Does not support the EEHVS.

Supports the EEHVS.

Amenities list is off balance. It lists amenities that already have a budget.

Schools are not on the amenities list because they are under the Evergreen Elementary School District's jurisdiction, not the city's.

**Additional Task Force Comments**

Task Force members provided the following questions and comments:

**Comment/Question****Response/Answer**

Will have a community meeting in regards to the Pleasant Hills Golf Course site.

Existing residents view Pleasant Hills Golf Course open space even though it is private open space.

Need more information regarding teacher housing at the Evergreen Valley College site.

**Adjourn**

Due to time constraints, Task Force members and the public were encouraged to submit additional comments to staff.

Chair Cortese referred to the comment in the October 19, 2005 Task Force meeting summary that light rail may be delayed to 2018 noting that the VTA may consider delaying light rail to 2019.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m. in memory of Lino Legaspi, founder of the West Evergreen SNI. The next Evergreen East Hills Vision Strategy Task Force meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, December 14, 2005, at 6:30 p.m. at San José City Hall.